

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of

Docket No: Q80489

Yoshinori YOSHIDA, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/802,883

Group Art Unit: 1794

Confirmation No.: 5194

Examiner: Thao T. TRAN

Filed: March 18, 2004

For: CLEANING SHEET AND ITS PRODUCTION METHOD AS WELL AS  
TRANSPORTING MEMBER HAVING SUCH CLEANING SHEET

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the interview conducted on May 6, 2008:

**REMARKS**

During the interview, the following was discussed :

1. Brief description of exhibits or demonstration: NONE
2. Identification of claims discussed: 1-6, 13-15 and 19-28
3. Identification of art discussed: Skinner et al and Grube.
4. Identification of principal proposed amendments: NONE
5. Brief Identification of principal arguments: **Skinner:** Applicants asserted that

Skinner differs from the claimed invention for several reasons. First, Skinner does not teach a cleaning layer that is penetrable by probe needle. Second, Skinner cannot remove and retain the debris from the needles. Third, Skinner is susceptible to having foreign material, including the

abrasive and removed substances, and even part of the hard coating layer left on the needles if used in the manner claimed. This is due to the tough hand hard coating on the surface of the substrate material in Skinner. **Grube:** Applicants asserted that Grube requires a two step cleaning process. In the first step, the foreign material is loosened by an abrasive. In the second step, the loosened material is removed by a sticky material. By contrast, the present invention is directed to the use of a non-abrasive material so that the needles are not worn, and the debris is retained inside the cleaning material and thus requires only one step.

6. Indication of other pertinent matters discussed: NONE

7. Results of Interview: the Examiner suggested that Applicants amend the claims to include structural and/or chemical element(s) that impart(s) the claimed properties in order to distinguish the presently claimed invention from the prior art of record, even though the Examiner also acknowledged Applicants' argument that "the functional limitations in the claims would be sufficient to distinguish over the prior art." Applicants asserted that the functional limitations are adequate to patentably define over diverse and incompatible prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

**It is believed that no petition or fee is required.** However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,  
*/Alan J. Kasper/*

---

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Alan J. Kasper  
Registration No. 25,426

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 10, 2008